

# **BOARD OF DESIGN REVIEW MINUTES**

**October 25, 2001**

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Walter Lemon III called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive

**ROLL CALL:** Present were Chairman Walter Lemon III; Board Members Hal Beighley, Anissa Crane, Ronald Nardoza, Ashetra Prentice and Stewart Straus. Board Member Monty Edberg was excused.

Associate Planner Tyler Ryerson, Associate Planner Scott Whyte and Recording Secretary Robyn Lampa represented staff.

## **VISITORS:**

Chairman Lemon read the format for the meeting and asked if any member of the audience wished to address the Board on any non-agenda item. There was no response.

## **STAFF COMMUNICATION:**

Associate Planner Scott Whyte referred to the meeting of the Board of Design Review scheduled for December 20, 2001, observing that this is the tentative date set for a Public Hearing for the Redstone Townhomes Type 3 Design Review. Pointing out that this date is close to the holidays, he emphasized that staff would like clarification of whether a quorum would be available before scheduling this Public Hearing. He explained that the application provides for fifteen to twenty town homes in a previously approved infill subdivision.

Associate Planner Tyler Ryerson noted that the proposed site for the development is at the northwest corner of Nora Road and 155<sup>th</sup> Avenue, adding that this previously approved subdivision includes single-family attached and detached homes, which has been approved administratively. He explained that staff is reluctant to schedule this Public Hearing for the previous meeting on December 13, 2001, due to several potentially lengthy applications which have already been scheduled.

On question, all members of the Board of Design Review indicated that they should be available on that date.

**NEW BUSINESS:****PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

Chairman Lemon opened the Public Hearing and read the format of the hearing. There were no disqualifications of Board Members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any Board Member to hear any agenda items or participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda.

**A. BDR 2001-0128: ALLIED POWER PRODUCTS OFFICE  
MANUFACTURING TYPE 3 DESIGN REVIEW**

This request is for Design Review approval for the construction of a two-story office manufacturing building, approximately 9,950 square feet in size, including the addition of parking area, lighting, and associated landscaping. The development proposal is located at on 6590 SW Fallbrook Place, and is more specifically identified on Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-23BD on Tax Lots 2600 and 1700. The affected parcels are zoned Industrial Park (IP) and are approximately a total of 1.3 acres in size. A decision for action on the proposed development shall be based upon the approval criteria listed in Section 40.10.15.3.C.

Mr. Ryerson presented the Staff Report and materials board and discussed the different aspects of the application, including the office manufacturing building, parking, crossover parking, access, refuge enclosure, landscaping and a retaining wall. He described the features of the proposal, as well as the materials and colors and landscaping materials to be used. Concluding, he recommended approval of the application, subject to Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 21, and offered to respond to questions and comments.

**APPLICANT:**

**LANCE STOUT**, Planning Consultant for *CIDA*, on behalf of *Allied Power Products*, introduced himself Robert Schroeder, Landscape Architect for *CIDA*, and Bob Peterson, representative of *Allied Power Products* and owner of the property. Observing that the applicant concurs with the Staff Report and proposed Conditions of Approval, he offered to respond to any questions or comments.

**ROBERT SCHROEDER**, Landscape Architect for *CIDA*, mentioned that the applicant has no issues with the Staff Report and does not intend to submit any formal presentation. Concluding, he provided illustrations of the plan and proposed materials and offered to respond to any questions or comments.

Chairman Lemon requested explanation of the recommendation for a split face, rather than a standard block, on the trash enclosure. He referred to the east elevation, guard rail and trash enclosure, and questioned whether the five or six foot high wall is standard CMU.

Mr. Schroeder observed that the trash enclosure and the wall could be the same type of block, noting that the drawings had been prepared prior to staff recommendations. He pointed out that while the trash enclosure is visible to anyone in the parking lot, the CMU wall is only visible from the City of Beaverton maintenance yard across the detention pond.

On question, Mr. Schroeder informed Mr. Beighley that the applicant does have a licensed landscape architect on their staff, adding that he had been unavailable at the time the drawings were prepared.

Mr. Beighley referred to House Bill No. 2196, which will become effective on January 1, 2002, clarifying that this legislation might impact how such services are advertised.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

On question, no member of the public appeared to testify regarding this application.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Straus **MOVED** and Mr. Beighley **SECONDED** a motion for the approval of BDR 2001-0128 – Allied Power Products Office Manufacturing Type 3 Design Review, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated October 18, 2001, including recommended Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 21.

The question was called and the motion, **CARRIED**, unanimously.

#### **B. BDR 2001-0124 -- TRUAX GASOLINE SERVICE STATION AT 14976 SW WALKER ROAD TYPE 3 DESIGN REVIEW**

This request is for Design Review approval for the construction of a retail gasoline service station, including the construction of three service station islands, a central kiosk, a trash enclosure, a 400 square foot office building, parking and associated landscaping. The development proposal is located at 14976 SW Walker Road, and is more specifically described on Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-05AD, Tax Lot 6700. While most of the site is zoned Neighborhood Service Center (NS), approximately ¼ of the site is zoned Urban Medium Density (R-2). The site is approximately 1.22 acres in size. Development of the proposed service station would be located on that portion of

the site zoned NS. A decision for action on the proposed development shall be based upon the approval criteria listed in Section 40.10.15.3.C.

Mr. Whyte presented the Staff Report and described the application requesting approval of a service station including a large canopy and six dispensing islands capable of servicing up to twelve vehicles simultaneously, adding that the proposal includes a small structure with storage, an office and restrooms. He provided some background information on the previous request for a Type 3 Design Review that had been approved by the Board of Design Review in 1998, adding that the Planning Commission had approved a Conditional Use Permit for extended hours of operation at that time as well. Observing that this application had expired after two years, he noted that although the applicant had submitted a new proposal that reflects some slight changes. He also noted that the Planning Commission had approved the new associated request for Conditional Use Permit approval on Wednesday, October 24, 2001. He recommended denial of the application without prejudice, based on the facts and findings of the Staff Report dated October 17, 2001, and referred to certain approval criteria, including Section 40.10.15.3.C.2, specifically criterion “a”, “g” and “h”. He further clarified that the Staff Report findings, with regard to the approval criteria, are basically reflective of the plans that were available at the time, which are the reduced set of plans that are attached to the back of the Staff Report. He mentioned that since that time, several revisions to that plan have been submitted, adding that the applicant would address these issues. He discussed concerns with a large landscaping planter along the property line, noting that the originally proposed width had only consisted of five feet, which staff had determined would not provide an adequate space for tree planting and wall construction.

Referring to the landscape plan, Mr. Whyte referred to two separate communications submitted by Ken Randall, dated September 19, 2001, who is the owner of the *Walker Square Apartments*, observing that he had submitted letters to both the Board of Design Review and the Planning Commission. He mentioned Item No. 4 of page 2 of Mr. Randall’s letter, requesting inclusion of residential design elements to the service station main canopy and other structures, adding that the issue of the canopy had been a concern in the Staff Report. He referred to the “hip roof” canopy, as approved in 1998 and that in the reduced set of plans, the applicant is now proposing a three-foot canopy without the “hip roof”. He pointed out that staff is in support of the 1998 design, noting that the rationale is provided within the Staff Report.

Observing that a sample of the proposed wall material had not been available at the time when the Staff Report was prepared, Mr. Whyte noted that these materials would be available for review this evening. He emphasized that the applicant’s proposed Durisol wall has not been utilized within the City of Beaverton in the past, pointing out that the applicant would clarify the material components of the wall. He mentioned that a colored rendering of the wall and the revised landscaping plan would also be available for review. He pointed out

that the Conditions of Approval within the Staff Report are reflective of the information available prior to recent submittals, and should the Board of Design Review chose to approve the applicant's request, it would be necessary to make some revisions. Concluding, he offered to respond to any questions or comments.

Observing that a particular drawing within the packet appears to be a bit of an orphan, Mr. Straus requested clarification of what is represented in the drawing of the canopy with a flat top.

Mr. Whyte explained the differences in the canopy drawings, noting what had been available at the time of the Staff Report and the revision that had been received at a later time.

Mr. Straus pointed out that the staff had expressed support of the previously approved designs, and questioned whether any of these designs are considered more appropriate than the others.

Mr. Whyte noted that one of the designs has a greater mass than what had been originally submitted, adding that it would involve approximately six feet of canopy, which is more than what would be considered necessary for a roof, and mentioned that staff had considered the possibility of putting the "hip roof" treatment on the canopy.

Mr. Straus requested clarification of whether Mr. Whyte's concern is related to the overall mass of the proposed roof, as opposed to the specific configuration or type of roofing treatment.

Mr. Whyte responded by stating that staff is concerned with the overall mass of the proposed roof.

Ms. Crane questioned whether a color board is available for review.

Mr. Whyte informed Ms. Crane that samples of the colors of the canopy structure are available.

Emphasizing that there had been changes and revisions to the original plans, Chairman Lemon requested clarification of whether the public has had the opportunity to review the revised plans.

Mr. Whyte pointed out that Kenneth Randall had submitted a letter expressing his concerns with the proposal, adding that he is not certain whether this individual is available to testify this evening. Noting that Mr. Randall is the only member of the public who has contacted staff with concerns regarding the application, he added that he had provided testimony regarding his concerns at the meeting of the Planning Commission the previous evening. He emphasized that some of the new information and materials are also new to staff.

Chairman Lemon pointed out that the Land Use Order approved by the Planning Commission for the associated application for a Conditional Use Permit had mentioned several issues that should be addressed by the Board of Design Review. He noted that rejection of the canopy submitted with the Staff Report, the revised canopy, or the original canopy proposed in 1998 would create issues with the recent decision by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Whyte mentioned that there is a great deal of latitude allowed within Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 9 of the Conditional Use Permit approval, adding that they are basically similar to the original Conditional Use Permit Conditions of Approval in 1998. He commented that the alternative design considerations had been submitted to the Planning Commission last night, but the Planning Commission did not review samples of the Durisol wall material.

**APPLICANT:**

**GREGORY KURAHASHI**, of *Kurahashi & Associates, Inc.*, representing *Merritt W. Truax, Inc.*, introduced himself and mentioned that their landscape architect is also available to respond to any questions or concerns.

**TAD TRUAX**, representing the owner of the property, *Merritt W. Truax, Inc.*, introduced himself.

Mr. Kurahashi explained that he would like to take the opportunity to respond to several of the comments staff made in their submittal, as well as the circumstances that led up to the current situation. He mentioned that the plan has been revised due to issues identified by staff, adding that the original Board of Design Review Conditions of Approval and the Planning Commission Conditions of Approval that had been prepared by former Senior Planner Bill Roth have only recently become available to the applicant. He discussed several revisions that had been made, including changes to the landscaping in order to allow for deciduous trees, adding that some other items were found that needed to be changed for specific reasons, which he would explain. He mentioned that due to other changes that had been made throughout the entire process and although the applicant had hoped for an approval tonight, a continuance could be an acceptable option at this time.

Mr. Lemon advised Mr. Kurahashi that the Board of Design Review would hear the applicant's presentation and accept public testimony prior to making any decision on a continuance. He expressed his appreciation to the application for considering a continuance, emphasizing the importance of first allowing any members of the public to provide testimony, adding that this testimony could potentially influence any revisions or decisions by the applicant.

At the request of Mr. Kurahashi, Mr. Truax explained the applicant's rationale for the wider band around the base of the hip roof, pointing out that the wide strip provides for more flexibility for color, design and signage. He pointed out that the applicant would most likely be utilizing Chevron products, and compared the development to one that had been recently approved at Murray Boulevard and Scholl's Ferry Road. On question, he informed Chairman Lemon that Chevron does have their own corporate colors, adding that part of the rationale for the wider band is to incorporate their graphical schematics, which was not an issue in the 1998 application.

Mr. Kurahashi discussed the criteria of the Planning Commission and described the wall design and the acoustical value of the block. He presented an informational handout provided by Durisol, dated October 24, 2001, emphasizing that the proposed Durisol wall would provide significant sound absorption. Observing that the original proposal had only provided for a partial wall, he noted that comments from staff had resulted in an extension of the wall for the entire length and around the corner. He pointed out that the wall weighs twenty pounds per square foot, adding that the applicant intends to utilize a dark colored stone, unless the Board of Design Review has another preference.

Chairman Lemon referred to the Durisol wall brochure, observing that the material is available in 18-inch or 24-inch high panels, and questioned how the horizontal joints are treated, specifically whether they are caulked or left rough.

Mr. Kurahashi stated that he is not certain how the horizontal joints would be treated.

Mr. Truax clarified that these joints would be grouted.

Mr. Kurahashi stated that the two-foot high paneling would have a fifteen foot overall separation between the columns. He pointed out that the original plan had been for twelve-foot panels, adding that the applicant had revised the plan to coincide with the placement of trees (15-feet on center) in the landscape. Observing that the longer panels also happen to be the thicker panels, he emphasized that the wall materials are designed as a sound barrier and also provide a more attractive appearance than the running block design. He pointed out that this particular material has not been regularly used in this area, noting that it has been utilized mainly in other areas for absorption of sound in highway work. He pointed out that one of the main reasons that Truax prefers to utilize this material is because it does not have a foundation beneath it, adding that it is easily and quickly constructed. He mentioned that the root systems of trees also have a little more room underneath, allowing them to spread and support the trees.

Mr. Kurahashi discussed the proposed landscaping plan, including interspersed Evergreen trees (Austrian Pines), with approximately a fifteen to twenty foot overall spread. Noting that these particular trees would serve very well to fill the

available space, he pointed out that they would reach a height of 35 to 55 feet and that these trees are also very hearty and would thrive in this area. He described other landscaping that would be provided, including purple, red or pink azaleas and rhododendrons. Observing that an air conditioning unit would be located in the back of the building, he pointed out that the applicant has proposed Juniper trees to screen this facility. Pointing out that the original plan provided for a sidewalk adjacent to the curb, he mentioned that staff would like this sidewalk moved back.

Mr. Beighley questioned whether Cherry trees would be used as street trees, and was informed by Mr. Kurahashi that the applicant is strongly opposed to white flowers and would consider any vegetation with red, purple or pink flowers.

Mr. Kurahashi pointed out that the applicant prefers that the landscaping cover the wall in an effort to prevent vandalism, adding that the wall has a textured look that resembles stone, and since the ground tapers down towards the back, there would also be some steps in the wall. He discussed the water quality facility, which has been moved, adding that the most logical placement would be at the lowest point of the site. He pointed out that the neighboring property does have the right to use the emergency ingress and egress, although it is not currently utilized. He observed that Merritt Truax prefers to locate the facility as close to the station as possible, leaving the remainder of the site available for development.

Mr. Straus referred to a bike path or walkway that runs across the site, and questioned whether this involves an easement or whether it would be relocated at some point in the future, and pointed out that this path currently divides the site into two portions.

Mr. Kurahashi noted that at the request of staff, the applicant has proposed a ten-foot wide walkway. He explained that there has been a modification to the 150<sup>th</sup> Avenue Roadway, which is six feet wider on the east side in order to align with the street across Walker Road, adding that this widening would modify the driveway of the multi-family property and has been coordinated with Washington County. Referring to the possibility of a continuance of this Public Hearing and particularly with regard to the proposed ten-foot wide sidewalk, he suggested that staff review the Facilities Review comments for certain reasons, including:

1. A ten-foot sidewalk reaching from the existing sidewalk to the property would tend to assume that this is actually a new bicycle path, rather than a dead end and an apartment complex;
2. An apartment complex has five-foot sidewalks, and there are no existing ten-foot or fifteen-foot sidewalks in the area; and



3. This could necessitate the addition of a z-pattern gate, which will require bicyclists to get off their bicycles and walk around the gate.

Mr. Kurahashi pointed out that the applicant would like to dedicate the land for a pedestrian way, rather than construct a sidewalk, which is inappropriate and would not be utilized at this time.

Mr. Straus suggested that an option could be incorporated into a land use review that would pertain to the dedication of a pedestrian way on the balance of the property for future development.

Observing that this involves a Facilities Review Condition of Approval, Mr. Whyte pointed out that the applicant is required to construct the sidewalk at a specific width and length to be placed within an easement.

Mr. Straus stated that he would like the issue of the sidewalk to be referred to Facilities Review for reconsideration, particularly if this item is continued to another date.

Chairman Lemon suggested that the Board of Design Review could specifically request a definitive response from Facilities Review justifying this requirement.

Mr. Straus observed that the continuation of this application would provide a good opportunity to resolve this issue.

Ms. Crane requested clarification of the materials to be used on the canopy.

Mr. Truax indicated that the applicant is willing to utilize a roofing material preferred by the Board of Design Review.

Mr. Straus observed that the roofing material could be clarified at the continued Public Hearing.

Mr. Truax stated that he is assuming that the roofing material would most likely be a colored aluminum shake, and questioned whether the Board of Design Review has any preference for this material.

Chairman Lemon expressed his opinion that a standing seam roof is more attractive.

Mr. Straus commented that all of the roofs should be of the same type of material, emphasizing that they should appear as if they belong together.

Mr. Truax stated that he would prefer to utilize the seamed roofing material that had been utilized on the project on SW Murray Boulevard and SW Scholls Ferry Road.

Mr. Kurahashi mentioned two small lights that would be located on posts by the air/water stations on the south side of the property by the sidewalk.

Mr. Truax indicated that the primary sign proposed would be a monument style sign to be located towards the corner, outside of the sight triangle.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

**JENNA GRIBBEN**, the Manager of the *Walker Square Apartments* introduced herself and Suzie Sandaal, who is a tenant, observing they represent the apartment complex owner, Ken Randall who is unavailable due to family issues. She explained that while Mr. Randall welcomes the new development, he also has concerns with the new building, as well as the abrupt transition from residential to commercial in the area. She referred to a letter he had submitted, adding that he had requested that Ms. Sandaal and herself address certain issues before the Board of Design Review, as follows:

1. The permanent rock wall should be at least eight-feet high and double-sided;
2. Additional evergreen trees should be included to provide a buffer zone;
3. Although the Planning Commission had approved the hours of 6:00 a.m. until 12:00 p.m., 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. would be the preferred hours of operation, and a 24-hour operation is not acceptable;
4. The design of the roofline should not be flat, but more uniform in appearance with that of the existing apartment buildings.

On question, Ms. Gribben informed Chairman Lemon that Mr. Randall had not discussed the proposed ten-foot sidewalk, although there is a play area in that location at this time and it is possible that he intends to further development in that area at some future point.

On question, the applicant had no further comments.

Referring to a possible continuance, Mr. Whyte discussed the necessity of specific changes to the Conditions of Approval in the Staff Report prior to approval. He noted some items had been discussed but not incorporated into the Staff Report.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Observing that this should be clarified with staff, Mr. Straus questioned the possibility of approving this application with Conditions of Approval and a request that the Facilities Review Committee reconsider the issue of the sidewalk.

Ms. Crane expressed her opinion that the application could be approved with the exception of the water quality issue, which would necessitate a continuance.

Ms. Prentice stated that she would prefer to continue the application due to the numerous changes.

Mr. Nardozza observed that he would also prefer a continuance in order to be certain that all issues are adequately addressed.

Mr. Straus expressed his opinion that the issue should be continued until November 15, 2001.

Mr. Lemon explained that the applicant would be required to sign a 120-day waiver in order to obtain a continuance.

Mr. Straus expressed his opinion that a continuance would allow many issues to be resolved, adding that this extra week could make a difference in the reconsideration of the sidewalk by the Facilities Review Committee.

On question, Mr. Kurahashi advised Mr. Whyte that the applicant is willing to continue the Public Hearing to November 15, 2001.

Mr. Straus **MOVED** and Mr. Nardozza **SECONDED** a motion that BDR 2001-0124 – Truax Gasoline Service Station at 14976 SW Walker Road Type 3 Design Review be continued to a date certain of November 15, 2001, to allow the applicant to address certain issues, as follows:

1. The final design of the wall on the north property line and associated landscaping;
2. The final design of the water quality feature;
3. Incorporation of lighting at the air and water stations;
4. Reconsideration of the ten-foot walkway in the fifteen-foot easement across the undeveloped portion of the parcel connecting SW Walker Road and the adjoining apartments, which must be addressed by the Facilities Review Committee; and
5. Incorporation of the revised roof design for the canopy and the utility building, which will incorporate standing seam pre-finished metal material of a slope to be determined by the applicant.

The question was called and the motion, **CARRIED**, unanimously.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The minutes of September 27, 2001, as written, were submitted. Chairman Lemon asked if there were any changes or corrections. Ms. Crane requested that the minutes be amended to reflect that the meeting was held in the Library, rather than at City Hall. Mr. Beighley **MOVED** and Ms. Prentice **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be adopted as written and amended.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED** unanimously, with the exception of Mr. Straus, who abstained from voting on this issue.

**MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.